DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 301 SP 037 605

AUTHOR	Pryor, Bonnie
TITLE	A College-School Connection to Renewal.
PUB DATE	1997-04-00
NOTE	17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Education Association (Minneapolis, MN, April 1997).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development Schools; *Program Development; Schools of Education; Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Qualifications; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Goodlad (John I); *National Network for Educational Renewal; Nebraska

ABSTRACT

The National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) consists of higher education institutions and partner K-12 schools promoting simultaneous renewal of teacher education and K-12 schools. The network helps renew teacher education by preparing educators who will: (1) provide all students with equitable opportunities for becoming educated, contributing citizens; (2) become experts at teaching and learning; (3) inquire continuously about optimal conditions for learning for all students; (4) model the highest qualities of democratic citizenry and community responsibility; and (5) be moral stewards committed to the value of the individual, the common good, and the benefits of schooling to society. After describing the Nebraska NNER, this paper discusses outcomes of its first 3 years. It then connects the network's goals to past educational reform efforts, including Excellence in Education, the Holmes Group, and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. The paper describes the goals of Creighton University (Nebraska) regarding membership, then lists 19 postulates, products of John Goodlad's research on teaching and teacher education, that provide direction for moving to more powerful teacher education programs. Finally, the paper describes some examples of the network's implementation in one college-school partnership. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A College-School Connection to Renewal

1997

NCEA CONVENTION

Minneapolis, MN

Bonnie Pryor
Cathedral Elementary School
3869 Webster St.
Omaha, Nebraska 68131
402-556-6655

ED 413 301

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bonnie J. Pryor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SP037605

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A College-School Connection to Renewal

Were any of you here the representatives sent from your region of the country, to the First National Congress for Catholic Schools in Washington in 1991?

One of the priorities established at the end of the congress centered around the concern that our local colleges and universities were doing little to aid secondary and elementary schools when they might well be able to do just that.

In justice, let me say that the reps from *this* very area told how the College of St. Thomas was letting teachers return to school for advanced degrees in education....free! The rest of us gasped. In Omaha, teachers got 1/2 rate at Creighton University. during the summer, but that was about it. I don't recall that anyone else could top either of those two records.

So for the past 6 years, it has been a priority of the NCEA elementary and secondary departments and I feel it fair to say, a significant concern of ACCU (Catholic colleges and universities) also, to try and boost the relationships between our Catholic schools and higher education.

**

Now, let me tell you what is presently blossoming throughout the country. Have you even heard of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) ?

What is it? The Network is a program of the Center for Educational Renewal, housed at the University of Washington and directed by John Goodlad. Its aim is to create a movement for simultaneous renewal of teacher education and K-12 schools in the United States,

1.

based on the research of Goodlad and others.

Participants in the Network are carefully selected for their commitment to the agenda of the Center. Currently there are 25 colleges and universities and 266 partner (K-12) schools involved in the Network. ** (end of overheads)

How does it work? Well in the State of Nebraska, NeNER (Nebraska Network for Educational Renewal), the former Dean of Education at Univ. of Nebraska at Lincoln, Dr. Robert Egbert, approached the membership of the Nebraska Association of Colleges of Teacher Education about the possibility of submitting a joint state application for membership in NNER. Dr. Egbert is a personal friend of John Goodlad and a member of the NNER Governing Board. After more than a year of meetings to discuss the idea, ten of the sixteen members of NACTE (Ne. Assoc. of Colleges of Teacher Education) developed and submitted an application for membership in the network.

The ten participating institutions in the Nebraska application are: College of St. Mary, Concordia College, Creighton University, Doane College, Hastings College, Union College, University of Nebraska at Kearney, University of Nebraska at Lincoln, University of Nebraska at Omaha, and Wayne State College.

Allow me to switch gears a minute here and say that we all know that hundreds and hundreds of experienced teachers take part in graduate work annually to try and obtain an MA or MS degree. These programs are generally offered by departments and schools of education.

Research has it that many teachers aren't happy with these programs. Most look at them as detached from the practical daily experience of schooling, generally taught as if the students (teachers) know nothing, and taught by professors who are fixated on specialized forms of knowledge. The general feeling seems to be that a huge

practical and intellectual gap exists between university instructors and the teachers who are their students.

At many universities and colleges, there are serious structural problems. For instance, people feel the inconvenience of coursework being offered in the evening after a long day of teaching. Participants enroll in these programs as individuals and not as a group from one school, which complicates their efforts to *apply program ideas to job situations.* Doesn't THAT make sense? There are those who complain that this individualistic approach ignores what we know about the power of peer-coaching and teacher study groups. (Myself, I think that is being a little hard on education departments, from my own personal experience.)

There has been documentation of complaints from experienced teachers who say the impact of these programs is minimal and possibly even negative. Even when based on pertinent content (like *professional* or *subject matter*), these programs tend to rely on didactic instruction which does not invite teacher participants to be active learners.

Theoretical university instruction discourages K-12 teachers from employing the very kind of learner-centered instruction vital to the improvement of public education in the United States. We know that nothing is more important to our democratic order than engaging elementary and secondary students in actively and critically thinking about our history and values, our social system, our environment, our world. This approach to teaching is important not only for educating citizens for democratic living but also for preparing workers for a labor market with complex and fast-changing jobs.

** What are the goals of the Nebraska Network for Educational Renewal?

The purpose of the Nebraska participation in the National Network for Educational Renewal is to engage those involved

in the preparation of K -12 educators in Nebraska in acollaborative inquiry at preparing educators who will:

1. Provide every student with an equitable opportunity for success in becoming an educated citizen and contributing community member.

2. Strive to become experts at teaching and learning.

3. Inquire continuously about the optimal conditions for learning for all students.

4. Model the highest qualities of democratic citizenry and community responsibility.

5. Be moral stewards who are committed to the value of each person as an individual, the common good, and the benefits of schooling in our society.

** WHAT HAPPENED: Well, during our first three years the membership yielded specific products and outcomes which are:

1. Joint research projects on important aspects of teacher preparation (e.g. student teaching and pre-student teaching practicum experiences) were completed.

2. Centers of Pedagogy were in the beginning stages of initiation. (This is a concept *and* a setting. It brings together the 3 major players in the preparation of a teacher: education department's professional teacher educators, K-12 schools, and the College of Arts and Sciences faculty, to inquiry into how best to prepare teachers and other educators to work together in applying the results of this inquiry.)

3. Exit portfolios, based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' model <u>and</u> the postulates, were being developed in order to be practically utilized.

4. The staff development activities of the Nebraska Consortium for the Improvement of Teacher Education, is

being expanded to include arts and sciences faculty and faculty from K-12 school involved in teacher education.

5. NeNER is going to develop recommendations to the State Board of Education for the enhancement of teacher certification processes and requirements, based on the postulates and on the products of collaborative work with K-12 and arts and sciences faculties. **(end of overhead)

Possibly by now you are thinking that those in education are continually trying to improve academic achievement for children and are regularly provided with a new strategy designed to insure student success. However, you are thinking, many of these reform efforts have failed. I've been through it myself! So let's go back a bit farther to the NATION AT RISK.

Some of you will be too young to remember that in 1981 the Sec. of Education, T. H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence in Education. It's task was to examine the quality of education in the United States and to make recommendations for its improvement. It was to assess the quality of teaching and learning in private and public schools, in colleges and universities; to compare U.S. schools with other nations' schools; to study the relationship between high school student achievement and college admissions requirements; to identify educational programs which resulted in student success in college; to assess how much student achievement has been affected by social and educational changes in the last 25 years; and to identify problems that must be overcome in order to successfully pursue the course of excellence in education.

In 1983 the findings were summarized in a report entitled <u>A Nation At Risk.</u> It was found that many secondary schools offer a "cafeteria-style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses."

Student choice has resulted in many students moving away from rigorous courses that used to be required for high school graduation and instead, were choosing something easier to fill that particular requirement. The Commission found that high schools had lowered their homework expectations; lowered expectations in the requirement of students to demonstrate mastery by rigorous examination and in the number and types of courses required to graduate. They also found that some selective college admissions requirements had been lowered and that many of the public 4 year colleges have no admission requirements other than a high school diploma.

*The Commission found that compared to other nations, U.S. students spend less time in school and spend less time on homework, the time in school is often used inefficiently, and students are not taught effective study skills and habits to help them be successful in college.

*Of most interest to this study were the findings on teaching. They found that: too many teachers are being drawn from the bottom quarter of graduating high school and college students;

*That teacher preparation curriculum is weighted heavily with courses in "methods" at the expense of courses in subjects to be taught;

*Severe shortages of teachers exist in mathematics, science and foreign languages, and in specialists in education for the gifted, language minority, and handicapped students;

*Half of the newly employed math, science, and English teachers are not qualified to teach these subjects; fewer than 1/3 of U.S. high schools offer physics taught by qualified teachers. (p. 22-23)

You'll remember they boosted high school graduation

requirements to 4 years of English, 3 years of math, science, and social studies, and 1 semester of computer science. Those going to college were to take 2 years of foreign language.

Do you recall that they also recommended that the 4-year college admission requirements be raised? (Category of Expectation.)

Recommendations also stated that colleges and universities offering teacher preparation will be judged on how well their students meet the criteria and therefore they must require students to meet high educational standards, to demonstrate an aptitude for teaching, and demonstrate competence in an academic discipline. There certainly were more recommendations, but you've digested enough to understand why education in this country was in "hot water" in the 80's!

In addition, you may have heard about the Holmes Group, which is a consortium of deans and chief academic officers from research institutions around the country interested in the reform of both teacher education and the teaching profession. Their goals and those of Goodlad are very similar.

HERE IS A SAMPLE of the 1986 Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group's five goals for education reform:

*Make education of teachers intellectually more solid.

*Recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skills, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work.

*Create standards of entry into the profession; create examinations and educational requirements that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible.

*Connect the group's institutions with schools.

*Make schools better places for teachers to work and learn.

(p.4)

You'll see that it's fair to say that Holmes from the 80's and Goodlad of the 90's are both saying the same thing.

Remember the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy? They established a task force on teaching as a profession and the result was A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, issued in May, 1986. When the task force recommended the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards they discovered that in order to meet the demand for teachers, standards had been lowered and some teachers were not certified. They also found out that teachers spent 10-50% of their time on non-instructional duties; constantly ran out of supplies, had little skilled support help; used outdated texts; and did not have enough time to do their job the way it should be done.

They addressed the shortage of minority teachers and recommended that a partnership among the schools, government, private sector, and the minority community be created .

Another recommendation involved the development of incentive systems that would link teacher compensation with the student performance scores.

They also recommended that salaries of teachers be increased enough to attract and retain teachers of high academic ability. Instead of salary increases being based on continuing education credits and years of service, the task force recommended that salary be based on four criteria:

1) job function--level of responsibility held by teacher
2) level of certification
3) seniority
4) productivity-contribution to improved student performance.

Their final recommendation was of the most interest. They asked that the undergraduate degree in education be abolished and be replaced by a strong arts and sciences education. Professional teacher education would be a graduate program and a Master of Teaching degree would be developed.

I did my graduate work at Creighton University in Omaha and thus was interested as to why Creighton's education department wished to be a part of these networks.

The outgoing dean, Dr. Ed O'Connor, whom many of you have heard speak on School Law, was replaced by Dr. Tim Dickel. Dr. Dickel believed that the agenda of the National Network was consistent with its goals and purposes and thought that participation in the Network would enable Creighton to collaborate with other members in advancing the agendas of both the Networks and the Department. He said it will help focus the Department on collaborative activities with K-12 schools and with other teacher training institutions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Through these, he said, "We will have a greater impact on our students, on the K-12 schools, and on the education of the K-12 students."

Creighton's Education Department saw their goals as parallel to the postulates *(which we'll go over shortly)*:

1. If rigorously promoted, the Education Department would acquire greater attention within its own University and be forced to be more accountable.

2. There would be greater cohesion between practitioners and University educators due to common objectives. Revisions of the teacher education curriculum would occur more rapidly. Responsibility for programs would be shared by the stakeholders.

3. The identification of potential educators would occur earlier due to the collaboration of school and University representatives. This could also result in stronger candidates and better internships (student-teaching experiences) due to dual supervision in diverse and challenging settings.

4. Students in public and private high schools could take their futures more seriously.

5. The existence of a Center of Pedagogy would provide a natural setting for collaborative research, comparisons, and evaluation studies. It would bring diverse groups together for this effort.

6. The Nebraska Network for Educational Renewal is a cooperative effort of ten colleges and universities that train teachers. With this initial cooperative base, it is expected that all ten will also be cooperative and collaborate on research and training projects involving our students and the students in the partner schools.

THE NINETEEN POSTULATES are the products of John Goodlad's research on teaching and teacher education, particularly his five-year study of the education of educators. These postulates provide direction for moving to more powerful teacher education programs. Those postulates which are particularly important to the work of Creighton's Education Department are from #4 to #19. Following are the postulates:

1. Programs for the education of the nation's educators

must be viewed by institutions offering them as a major responsibility to society and be adequately supported and promoted and vigorously advanced by the institution's top leadership.

2. Programs for the education of educators must enjoy parity with other professional education programs, full legitimacy and institutional commitment and rewards for faculty geared to the nature of this field.

3. Programs for the education of educators must be autonomous and secure in their borders, with clear organizational identity, constancy of budget and personnel, and decision-making authority similar to that enjoyed by the major professional schools.

4. There must exist a clearly identifiable group of academic and clinical faculty members for whom teacher education is the top priority; the group must be responsible and accountable for selecting diverse groups of students and monitoring their progress, planning and maintaining the full scope and sequence of the curriculum, continuously evaluating and improving programs, and facilitating the entry of graduates into teaching careers.

5. The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members described above must have a comprehensive understanding of the aims of education and the role of schools in our society and be fully committed to selecting and preparing teachers to assume the full range of educational responsibilities required.

6. The responsible group of academic and clinical faculty members must seek out and select for a predetermined number of *student* places in the program, those candidates who reveal an initial commitment to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities to be assumed, and make clear

to them that preparing for these responsibilities is central to this program.

7. Programs for the education of educators, whether elementary or secondary, must carry the responsibility to ensure that all candidates progressing through them possess or acquire the literacy and critical-thinking abilities associated with the concept of an educated person.

8. Programs for the education of educators must provide extensive opportunities for future teachers to move beyond being students of organized knowledge to become teachers who inquire into both knowledge and its teaching.

9. Programs for the education of educators must be characterized by a socialization process through which candidates transcend their self-oriented student preoccupations to become more other-oriented in identifying with a culture of teaching.

10. Programs for the education of educators must be characterized in all respects by the conditions for learning that future teachers are to establish in their own schools and classrooms.

11. Programs for the education of educators must be conducted in such a way that future teachers inquire into the nature of teaching and schooling and assume that they will do so as a natural aspect of their careers.

12. Programs for the education of educators must involve future teachers in the issues and dilemmas that emerge out of the never-ending tension between the rights and interests of individual parents and the role of the schools in transcending parochialism and advancing community in a democratic society.

13. Programs for the education of educators must be infused with understanding of and commitment to the moral obliga-

tion of teachers to ensure equitable *access to* , and *engagement in* , the best possible K-12 education for all children and youths.

14. Programs for the education of educators must involve future teachers not only in understanding schools as they are, but in alternatives, the assumptions underlying alternatives, and how to effect needed changes in school organization, pupil grouping, curriculum, and more.

15. Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experience, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies.

16. Programs for the education of educators must engage future teachers, in the problems and dilemmas, arising out of the inevitable conflicts and incongruities, between what is perceived to work in practice and the research and theory supporting other options.

17. Programs for the education of educators must establish linkages with graduates for the purpose of both evaluating and revising these programs and easing the critical early years of transition into teaching.

18. Programs for the education of educators require a regulatory context with respect to licensing, certifying, and accrediting that ensures at all times the presence of the necessary conditions embraced by the seventeen preceding postulates.

19. Programs for the education of educators must compete in an arena that rewards efforts to continuously improve, on the conditions embedded in all of the postulates and tolerates no short cuts intended to ensure a supply of teachers.

HOW IS THE NETWORK ORGANIZED?

I can tell you what we did: A State Board of Directors provides the leadership for the work of the NeNER. This board is made up of one teacher education faculty member plus one K-12 or arts and sciences representative associated with each of the ten institutions of higher education cooperating in the network consortium. Currently, Dr. Tim Dickel, Professor and Chair of Creighton's Education Department is Creighton's representative and I am the other representative, as the partner school of Creighton. Now that NeNER is up and running, members of the faculty of the Education Department, students in the department's teacher education program, K-12 faculty from partner schools, and College of Arts and Sciences faculty will provide leadership and direction for our activities.

In Omaha, we are NOW working together toward the improvement goal. Three of us: Department of Education, College of Arts & Sciences, and K-12 educators have formed a partnership, working together, learning from one another and developing partnerships to improve teacher education programs and teaching. This IS what Goodlad calls a Center of Pedagogy. How have we done this:

1) We sat down and thought about where we at St. Cecilia's, needed help. We needed it in science. Creighton sent their finest science teacher to our campus and she taught a course in science for elementary teachers after school one day a week for 3 hours. They only had to pay one half of the tuition Creighton charges and we helped with the other half. I had 11 teachers sign up for it and they loved it, even though it went through their dinner hour! Students from the Creighton campus came and joined the class during the final hour of it and the mix worked out well.

2) We don't have our own art teacher. Our teachers have been trained in discipline based art and work hard at it but it isn't as good as having our own teacher! (I've been there, trying to teach perspective as a junior high teacher. Even when I had somebody else put it on the board for me. I couldn't do it!) Dr. Barbara Brock, an education professor is also an art teacher and former elementary principal. She came to our campus with art students and had them go into our classrooms and teach art. Next semester, she will teach an art class on our campus for elementary teachers.

3) The chair of the education department, Dr. Tim Dickel visits us during faculty meetings when possible. He came on an inservice day and got us trained in e-mail and all on Creighton's e mail system.

4) Dr. Tom Cook, also an education professor at Creighton came and addressed our parents at a Home & School meeting. He was well received. He spoke about Catholic family customs, traditions, etc. in the home and encouraged them.

5) We let the psychology students come up and video tape and question six year olds for a study they are doing on the significance of how children are questioned in courts.

6) We are hoping for some faculty help in technology.

We are extremely pleased with our partnership. I want to show you WHERE in the country these triads have been formed. Don't be afraid to approach your local college or university and see if you can interest the Dept. of Education in Dr. John Goodlad's Network for Educational Renewal. Here's a copy of the postulates to help you start.

Good luck and thank you for coming and being such a wonderful group.